



SOME
DOCUMENTS,

&c. &c.

CONNECTED WITH

TRACT FOR THE TIMES,

Nº. XC.

CONTENTS.

1. The Resolution of the Hebdomadal Board.
2. The Rev. Mr. Newman's Letter to the Vice-Chancellor.
3. Letter of Oxoniensis Catholicus to the Editor of *The Times*.
4. Letter to the Editor of the *Morning Post* from Discipulus Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ.
5. The object of the Tracts for the Times, from the *Morning Post*.
6. Remarks on the late Revival of Catholic Principles, from *The Times Newspaper*.

OXFORD:

W. GRAHAM, HIGH-STREET.

1841.

OXFORD: PRINTED BY J. MUNDAY, JUN. QUEEN-STREET.

SOME DOCUMENTS,

&c. &c.

AT a Meeting of the Vice-Chancellor, Heads of Houses, and Proctors, in the Delegates' Room, March 15th, 1841 :—

Considering that it is enjoined in the Statutes of this University (Tit. III. Sect. 2, Tit. IX. Sect. II, §. 3, Sect. V, §. 3) that every Student shall be instructed and examined in the Thirty-nine Articles, and shall subscribe to them ; considering also that a Tract has recently appeared, dated from Oxford, and entitled “ Remarks on certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles”, being No. 90 of the Tracts for the Times, a series of anonymous publications purporting to be written by Members of the University, but which are in no way sanctioned by the University itself ;

Resolved, That modes of interpretation such as are suggested in the said Tract, evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of errors, which they were designed to counteract, defeat

the object, and are inconsistent with the due observance, of the above-mentioned Statutes.

P. WYNTER, Vice-Chancellor.

LETTER FROM THE REV MR. NEWMAN.

MR. VICE-CHANCELLOR,—I write this respectfully to inform you, that I am the author, and have the sole responsibility, of the Tract on which the hebdomadal board has just now expressed an opinion, and that I have not given my name hitherto, under the belief that it was desired that I should not. I hope it will not surprise you if I say, that my opinion remains unchanged of the truth and honesty of the principle maintained in the Tract, and of the necessity of putting it forth. At the same time, I am prompted by my feelings to add my deep consciousness that every thing I attempt might be done in a better spirit, and in a better way ; and, while I am sincerely sorry for the trouble and anxiety I have given to the Members of the Board, I beg to return my thanks to them for an act which, even though founded on misapprehension, may be made as profitable to myself as it is religiously and charitably intended.

I say all this with great sincerity,

And am,

Mr. Vice-Chancellor,

Your obedient Servant,

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN.

Oriel College, March 16th.

(From *The Times* of March 17th, 1841.)

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,—I hope you will not consider it inconsistent with your excellent rule of avoiding theological controversy in your columns to insert this brief letter. A statement has just been put out by the Board of Heads of Houses and Proctors, condemnatory of No. 90 of Tracts for the Times, and it is not impossible that some persons may, from misapprehension, represent this as an “University censure” of the production in question. Your readers should therefore be informed, that this Board consists indeed of individuals who from their age and station are worthy of every deference, but *who are in no way authorized by the Statutes* on such a subject to represent the University.

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

OXONIENSIS CATHOLICUS.

Oxford, Tuesday Morning, March 16th.

(From the *Morning Post* of March 17.)

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,—I quite agree with your correspondent, in your publication of this morning, that the whole question respecting the recent Tract, No. 90, which has caused such a sensation, is one of *matter of fact only*. Nothing can put in a clearer light the gross

and cruel injustice of the cry which has been raised against it than this very circumstance. For how stands the affair? Certain learned and pious individuals are pertinaciously charged with holding opinions inconsistent with the Articles of the Church of England. Two courses are open to them, either to leave the charge unrefuted or to rebut it: For some time they adopted the former alternative, and, as every one knows, on that very account the press, under the control of the low Church and Radical party, teemed with every species of libel and misrepresentation against them. They think fit, therefore, to follow the opposite plan; and in an elaborate, and as I am convinced unanswerable, pamphlet, demonstrate not only that the Articles are not contrary to, but in conformity with, their opinions, which they distinguish by the epithet of "Catholic and primitive," but also do not apply even to the Decrees of the Council of Trent, seeing (which I thought every one knew before) that the Articles were fixed and promulgated before these Decrees were made. So that because they prove *more than they are required to do* in their defence, and show in the most convincing manner that no tenet of theirs is forbidden or in any way interfered with by the Church of England, their adversaries suddenly turn round upon them and declare that they explain away the Articles, when no explanation of any kind was attempted, and charge them with wishing to subvert the Church of England and change her profession of faith, when they are

giving the most potent and satisfactory reasons why *no man holding their opinions can possibly leave that Church*, or even in any particular dissent from it.

Yours, &c.

DISCIPULUS ECCLESIE ANGLICANÆ,
AND M.A. OF OXFORD.

Athenæum, March 17th.

(The following articles, bearing on the general principles of the Tracts, it has been thought desirable to reprint.)

(From the *Morning Post* of March 18th, 1841.)

The principle of the Editors of the Tracts for the Times seems to have been to allow of the occasional promulgation of merely individual views and speculations, for the sake of the greater force and naturalness which pervades the unrestricted expression of individual thoughts. The Tracts do not profess to lay down a system. Their object is to awaken thought—to suggest investigation—to combat modern prejudice with the learning of ancient times—to exalt the views of Churchmen—to exhibit the Church of England in another aspect than that of its *negative* character of mere Protestantism, and to assert its positive character of the Anglo-Catholic Church. We believe that upon the whole the Tracts for the Times have had great success in the achievement of these objects, and have therefore done great good.

(From *The Times* of March 4th, 1841.)

WHATEVER may be the merits or the faults of the gentlemen at Oxford, to whom Lord Morpeth and Mr. O'Connell alluded, it is notoriously false to say that any one of them ever thought of "disclaiming" any single doctrine of the Church to which he belongs: the whole aim and object of their teaching is to recommend certain doctrines as *identical* with those of the Liturgy, Canons, and Articles of the Church of England. They prefer indeed to rescue from Popery the appellation of Catholic, which has ever been the inheritance of all Apostolic Churches, and they are not overzealous for the denomination of Protestant, which occurs nowhere in the Prayer Book, which expresses no positive belief, and which is the common property of all who are separated from Rome, however widely differing among themselves. But we think it will be difficult for any man to show that in this respect, or any other, their doctrine or practice (whether erroneous or not) contradicts any oaths which they have sworn: and we wish all who speak ill of them were equally blameless in this respect.

We have said so much as this, not because we desire to identify ourselves with the opinions of the gentlemen in question (who, after all, as Sir Robert Inglis truly said, are not the University of Oxford) but partly because we were formerly led, on the very authority quoted by Lord Morpeth, to speak of them in terms of harshness which we now regret; and

partly because it appears to us unjust and unmanly to single out absent and unrepresented men for an attack in the House of Commons, without any previous notice.

(From *The Times* of March 6th.)

SEVERAL Journals have laboured very perseveringly for some time past to connect *The Times* with what they are pleased to call "Puseyism"; and the fact of our having on Thursday last expressed a feeling of regret that we had formerly spoken in terms of unmerited harshness of the Authors of the Oxford Tracts, is declared to be "ominous", by a contemporary, whose qualifications for deciding upon questions relating to the doctrine of the Church of England are tolerably notorious.

Whenever we may be led (as must sometimes happen to all journalists) to place too much confidence in plausible *ex parte* statements to the prejudice of any individual or body of men, we shall always be ready, upon all fitting opportunities, to express regret for having so done. But it is not to be supposed that we, therefore, assume for the future an attitude of partisanship on behalf of those individuals, or hold ourselves in any degree responsible for what they may do or say. Fair play and no favour is all that any man engaged in controversy can reasonably desire; and it is all that we shall ever undertake to give.

It is not our vocation to intermeddle in theological controversies ; the delicacy and difficulty of handling them well, the reverence due to the subjects of which they treat, the amount of leisure and research necessary to be bestowed upon them (not to allude to any higher considerations) are sufficient to repel us from the attempt. And even if we entertained no doubt as to our qualifications for such a function, we should be deterred by a recollection of the unavoidable mixture of matter which finds its way into the columns of every newspaper. Considering the turmoil of political affairs with which we have to do, we think it best in every way to leave the discussion of strictly religious questions to the authorized teachers of religion, endeavouring only to keep the general principles and practical duties of religion always in view.

With respect to that school of theology in the English Church, of which so much has been said, we take its actual position to be this. It originated in a feeling of alarm at certain legislative measures which were passed, or known to be in contemplation, during the three first years of Lord Grey's ministry ; and more especially at the persecutions and privations of the parochial Clergy in Ireland, consequent on the refusal to pay tithes ; the increasing power and pretensions of Popery in Ireland, and Protestant dissent in England, and the disposition manifested by many of the clergy and laity to call for important alterations in the Prayer Book. Of this, a letter recently published by the Hon and Rev. Arthur Perceval, in the

Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette, furnishes conclusive evidence. Under the influence of these feelings, Mr. Perceval himself, and several others (including, with the remarkable exception of Dr. Pusey, all who have since become eminent among the Oxford divines) met, in the summer of 1833, at the house of the late Rev. Hugh James Rose, then Domestic Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury. After discussing the state and prospects of the Church, they came to the agreement, that the only way of counteracting the danger by which the Church seemed to be menaced, was by recalling the minds of Churchmen to the *distinctive* principles of the Liturgy, Canons, and Articles ; from which there was thought to have been a very general departure. They agreed in considering these distinctive principles to be the same which are now branded with the name of "Puseyism" ; and these, as the principles distinguishing the doctrine of the Church of England from all modern innovations, whether Popish or Protestant, and identifying it with the primitive faith of the universal Church, they determined diligently to recommend and teach. They believed that by so doing they were only discharging (with the zeal necessary in difficult times) an obligation imposed upon them by their ordination vows.

Upon this resolution they acted, and in carrying it out (whether right or wrong) they certainly met with extraordinary success. Their teaching has now sunk deeply into the heart of the Church of England ; it has acquired not merely a numerical, but a moral

power and influence, which must henceforth make it impossible for any statesman to despise or overlook, and highly indiscreet for any political party unnecessarily to alienate, this element in the constitution of society. The younger Clergy are said to be very generally of this school ; it has no want of advocates among their seniors ; it has penetrated into both Houses of Parliament ; and we are confidently informed (we suppose, therefore, upon some foundation) that it has met with countenance from the Bishops themselves. It has completely succeeded in awakening in the Church that vital spirit of re-action, the necessity for which called it into existence. We hear nothing *now* of a demand for the admission of Dissenters into the Universities, of proposals to abolish subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, or of contemplated changes in the Liturgy ; or, if we do still hear of them, the manner in which they are received, as contrasted with their popularity in 1833, illustrates the completeness of the victory still more forcibly.

The means by which these striking effects have been produced are not less remarkable than the effects themselves. The doctrines of the school in question (whether good or bad) have not been recommended by any stimulating excitements—any appeals to the passions or the affections rather than to the conscience and the reason. We have had no camp-meetings, or field-preachings, like those of Whitfield and Wesley ; no platform-speeches, no Exeter-hall agi-

tation ; no advertised and placarded sermons by popular pulpit orators. Neither is it true that the University lecture-room has been the theatre of these triumphs. Of the gentlemen whose names have come before the public as leading men in the school, two only, Mr. Sewell, and Dr. Pusey, are in any way connected with the instruction of youth ; and Dr. Pusey has only a very limited class of Students in Hebrew. It is through the press alone, and by the influence of their lives, that these gentlemen have endeavoured to disseminate their opinions beyond the sphere of their immediate duty.

And what is the character of their writings, and of their lives ? No man, however widely differing from them, can open any of their publications, without perceiving that they write with learning, ability, calmness, seriousness, command of temper, a strong sense of responsibility, forbearance, and courtesy of language towards their adversaries. No man can know any thing of their lives, without being aware that they act consistently with their professions ; that they are more than usually strict, circumspect, self-denying, and (as far as man can judge by outward demeanour) pious. The most respectable of their opponents in controversy, especially the Master of the Temple and the present Bishop of Chichester, have borne free and generous testimony to their merits in these respects. Such antagonists never, even for a moment, expressed or felt the smallest doubt, that the men with whom they had to deal were sincerely

attached to the Church of England, firmly persuaded that their doctrine was identical with hers, and utterly incapable of deliberately violating their oaths.

No calumny, we are satisfied, was ever more unmerited than this, which casts upon men who are peculiarly zealous for ecclesiastical authority (and who are maligned for being so) the imputation of disregarding it in practice. *They* were not "Puseyites" who contended for the abolition of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles in our Universities. They were not "Puseyites" who, in 1833, made the press teem with pamphlets in favour of changes in the Prayer Book. They are not "Puseyites" who, having sworn to obey the Rubric, depart from it as often as they think proper in the celebration of Divine Service. They are not "Puseyites" who alter or leave out such expressions as do not suit their notions in the offices of burial and baptism. But men who do these things, together with the organs of that political party which has abetted all the attacks of dissent upon the Church of England, accuse men who do them not of unfaithfulness to the Church; and politicians whose whole official life has been devoted to the advancement of Popery in the United Kingdom, cry out "No Popery" with the loudest, if an Oxford Clergyman dares to suggest that the Church of Rome, though corrupt, may possibly not be Antichrist,* or ventures to breathe

* See Review of Todd's Donellan Lectures, Brit. Crit. Oct. 1840.

a prayer for the restoration of Christian unity throughout the world.

¶ For further information on the subject, among other Works, the reader is referred to the Articles in the Quarterly Review on “Memorials of Oxford” (Jan. 1838)—“Oxford Theology” (March, 1839)—Mr. Newman’s Letter to Dr. Faussett—Professor Pusey’s Letter to the Lord Bishop of Oxford—Professor Keble’s Sermon on Tradition—Archdeacon Manning’s Sermon on the Rule of Faith—Dodsworth’s Lectures on the Church—Mr. Oakeley’s Preface to his Whitehall Sermons—Dr. Hook’s five Sermons—Letters of a Reformed Catholic—Rev. T. K. Arnold’s Reply to Mr. Baptist Noel’s Pamphlet (Brit. Mag. March, April, 1840)—Mr. Palmer’s Treatise on the Church (Reviewed British Critic, July, 1838)—Bishop Jebb’s Tract for All Times—the Correspondence between Professor Sewell and Dr. Miller, of Armagh, in the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal—and for an exposition and defence of the doctrine of “*Reserve* in the Communication of Religious Knowledge”, to the present Bishop of Winchester’s Work on the Ministerial Character of Christ—Chapter on the “Gradual Teaching of the Church”, pp. 179-229, especially p. 221. Ed. 1824. &c. &c. &c.

ERRATUM.

PAGE 15, for "Gradual Teaching of the Church", read "Gradual Teaching of Christ".



